

An Appeal for the Union.

BY

A PHILADELPHIA WHIG.

PREFACE.

THE following tract, composed of a series of articles, communicated to, and originally published in, the *Philadelphia Evening Journal*, needs no commendation for such readers as think calmly and soberly, and desire, in the present crisis of national politics, to do what is right. It is a temperate appeal to reason and patriotic intelligence. Whoever reads one page will be tempted onward by the best sort of persuasion—that which appeals to no prejudice or passion and does not contradict by words of unkindness any strong preconceived opinion. It is not the wail of a technical politician, but of a citizen of Philadelphia, mature in years and conservative in principle, who, when he has devoted himself to the public service, has done so most unselfishly. He feels all he writes to be true. The author of this pamphlet is by education and early association a member of the Society of Friends, and has no sentiment in common with propagandists of slavery or the fierce fanaticism of technical Abolition. He stands, and has always stood, on the good old Pennsylvanian platform, and looking thence on the contests of the day, sees no escape from civil discord and agitation but in the election to the Presidency of a Pennsylvania statesman who has proclaimed that the great aim of his administration will be to put an end to slavery agitation. Let every lover of peace read and meditate on what is thus written.

1215
482

THE UNION.

NO. I.

THERE is a crisis in our public affairs that irresistibly exacts the anxious attention of the reflective citizen. The people are called upon to make choice of a President; and on that choice may depend the peace of the country—the safety of the Union. Many candidates are presented for the high office, and one for every party except for those who have retained the name of Whigs, and who have heretofore looked up to such leaders as Clay, Webster, Sergeant, and Everett to guide and direct the councils of the Republic. What now are those Whigs to do who have attached themselves to no other party? What are the principles that should guide them, and what the measures they should pursue, they can have no difficulty in deciding; but who among the candidates is most likely to adopt and sustain those principles and measures, is now the question; not, it may be, in statesmanship so exalted as that which has so long commanded our admiring gaze, and reflected glory upon the national character, but who will most safely administer the national government and most surely sustain the Union.

Let us first consider the requisites that the high office in the emergency demands, and then select him who will most nearly fulfil the required conditions.

The purpose paramount to all others to be held in view is, to sustain in good faith the Constitution of the United States. In the spirit of forbearance, and the desire for the general good that formed it, can it alone be preserved and perpetuated. We cannot doubt the wisdom and safe guidance of the patriotic statesmen who framed it: men tried and purified in the ordeal of the Revolution, and instructed in its necessity by the trials and perils of that, but for Providential aid, unequal contest.

In executing the great task of forming the Constitution, the same element of discord that now unhappily distracts our country, arose in the Convention; but it was then met, and, for the then existing States,

finally settled; and it is now our transmitted obligation to abide by it, and in all things concede equal rights to all the States, having regard to their local institutions. Without such a concession, the Union could not have been formed, nor can it now be preserved; and the alternative was then and is now disunion, insecurity, border-wars, weakness, exposure to foreign aggression, and the extinction of republican freedom. It is only by a conservative feeling in the people, and a wise and masterly statesmanship in their public servants, that the Union can be maintained, and that the peace, prosperity, and strength it gives, can sustain the example of free institutions and man's power of self-government for the imitation of the world.

It was well for Washington and his compatriots, after the achievement of our national independence, to form a more perfect government, in the spirit of compromise and conciliation; it is equally our duty to cultivate the same spirit, to preserve the Constitution that cements our Union, preserves the domestic peace, and extends free State governments over this broad continent, while it exhibits our whole people in the attitude of a united strength against whatever combination may be formed against us by the despotic powers of Europe.

Those nominations of candidates, therefore, which partake of a sectional character—that array one portion of the people against another—that would form an administration of the General Government to favor the views of one portion of the country, at the sacrifice of the security of the local laws and institutions of another—cannot but tend to dis sever the Union, endanger the peace of the country, and bring into peril the Federal Government. It is no sufficient answer for one section to say that the other was the aggressor, and that wrong and usurpation must be met by resistance. Crimination and recrimination, action and reaction, have been so often repeated, and each wrong provoked to a greater, until a conflict of arms has ensued, and the process that leads to such a result cannot but be pronounced evil, and each reaction a wrong, except as it consists in fair argument and persuasion, and the fair and peaceful determination of the ballot-box. The temporary wrong that proceeds from a peaceful waiting for the correction of an ever-recurring sound public opinion, is an infinitely more safe and sure reliance for redress than a resort to violence. Let us not, then, elect an executive that shall aggravate existing evils; let us not establish a government representing the feelings of a part of the country, to carry out the inflammatory views of a section; but an executive of tried experience and national views, who, governed by the Constitution, shall know no preference for any section in the administration of national affairs—a government representing and holding an equal balance over the whole country, and nothing less than the whole country.

A WHIG.

THE UNION.

NO. II.

WITH a large majority of the States who formed the Constitution in 1787 holding slaves, it was an inevitable feature in it that the right of the States to continue to hold and reclaim their slaves should be recognised in that instrument. It was a condition absolutely essential to its adoption, and without which no national government could have been established, and it is equally a condition to its preservation. It was formed not to establish slavery, but of necessity to tolerate it in the States where it existed, or where it might be authorized, leaving its existence or extinction to depend upon the public opinion of the people of the respective States. Where our forefathers left it there American statesmen must leave it as long as the Constitution is to be upheld, leaving the press and public opinion free to combat with it, to check and extinguish if they can, but nothing short of a revolution to change or impair one guaranty of the Constitution. All moderate and sound thinking men concede this; and it is only an extreme party that dares to make an assault upon the Constitution itself that will deny the soundness of the position.

But many well-disposed citizens make the admission with the limitation that slavery shall be restricted to the States where it existed when the Constitution was adopted, or where since established; and that it shall not be extended over new territory. Were the writer a settler in a new territory he, too, would resist its introduction to the last extremity, and failing in the effort, remove from its presence as among the greatest of evils, greater even to the white than the black race. But what are the rights of the people of all the States in the unsettled territories thereof? They are equal; and when they shall have settled any new territory in numbers sufficient to form a State, and shall have framed a Constitution, it is their right, if the right of emigrants from the several States be equal, to adopt or reject the institution of slavery. The event must depend upon the character and sentiments of the settlers. The strife, if peaceful, is a fair and just one, and we of the North ever breathe our aspirations of hope for the success of the freeman; and preferring the white race, and the spirit of freedom that burns in the bosom of the freeman, pray that the virgin soil of our western domain may be inhabited only by freemen. But we can never forget the faith plighted for us by our patriot ancestors; we can never forget the united achievement of our independence, nor the glories of a yet brief history, which never could have been ours had we not been a united people. It is worse than

profitless to boast what our section did, and another did not, towards the common success, since if we had not been united, and inspired by the same love of freedom, our forefathers never could have achieved independence, and we should not now be numbered among the great nations of the earth, and with the certain destiny of becoming the greatest, if we can but preserve our glorious Union.

That the settlers in a new territory shall enjoy rights perfectly equal, the General Government should be absolutely neutral, taking care to secure to all equal protection, and a free choice in the character of their institutions, without sectional favor, and without external interference. If the General Government fails in this, it fails in its duty, and becomes a partizan, and must lose the respect and confidence of all those who are wronged by its partial administration; it ceases to be a just and national government; it betrays the trust reposed by the Constitution. That the national government has the power to give law to and govern the territories until erected into States, it must be a matter of astonishment to every constitutional lawyer to find questioned so frequently of recent times, and it shall be one of my purposes to refute the error. It is necessary that this should be understood, that the people adventuring into new territories may know their claims upon the government, and not be left a prey to intestine feuds, more than to the tender mercies of neighboring savages; and that those entrusted with the powers of government may be held to their proper responsibility. It is right that the enterprising settlers shall, in due time, mould their own laws and institutions, but they must be secured in equal rights during the process; and when in sufficient numbers, offering a constitution, republican in form, and adapted in all respects to fulfil her obligations of a State to the Constitution of the United States and her sister States, it is much a matter of course that a new State will be admitted into the Union. But that the institution of slavery is incorporated into the new constitution is not a disqualifying feature to her admission; otherwise, the settlers in the territories from the different States would not have equal rights in the territories of the Union; otherwise, the people there would not have the rights of freemen to the same extent they have in all the other States; otherwise, the new State would not be sovereign and independent, as all other States, and the people thereof, sovereign and independent, saving only the concessions made by them in the Constitution of the United States.

This view is, of course, irrespective of *territory ceded* to the United States or a State under special stipulations, which, as they involve the obligation of a contract under the Constitution of the United States, no State can impair the force thereof. *Green vs. Biddle*, 8 Whea. 1. This is a different case from the erection of a State upon territory

untrammelled by compact, and the attempt in such case by Congress to impose terms against the will of the people in the act of forming a State government, beyond the requirements of the Constitution of the United States. A WHIG.

THE UNION.

NO. III.

I HAVE said that Congress can give the law to the Territories of the United States, and is, consequently, responsible for the preservation of the peace and the protection and security of the inhabitants therein. It is among the express powers granted by the States and the people thereof when they formed the Constitution. Every community must have a government, and if the government of a Territory is not in the United States, or those to whom Congress have delegated power therein, it is nowhere. The Supreme Court of the United States decided, in an opinion delivered by Chief Justice Marshall, that: "Till Florida become a State, * * * Florida continues to be a Territory of the United States, governed by virtue of that clause in the Constitution which empowers Congress 'to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States.'" 1 Peter's R. 542. "No one has ever doubted the authority of Congress to erect territorial governments within the territory of the United States under the general language of the clause," says Story, 2 Constitutional Law, § 1325.

If it were not an express grant it would seem to be necessarily implied from other expressly granted powers. There has been expressly granted to the Federal Government the power to declare war and the power to make treaties; consequently, the power to make conquests of territory, to make peace and acquire territory, of course to acquire for the nation and not for any one or more States less than the whole, consequently, territory to come under the laws of no one of the States, but under such as the government to which it was ceded should impose. The moment the General Government was formed for national purposes these inseparable rights and incidents of national sovereignty ensued under the law of nations. Justice Johnson, another Judge of the Supreme Court of the Union, from South Carolina, and always strict in his adherence to State rights, had held that "the right of acquiring territory is altogether incidental to the treaty-making power, and perhaps to the power of admitting new States into the Union; and the government of such acquisitions is, of course, left to the legislative power of the Union, as far as that power is uncontrolled by treaty." "In case of such acquisitions, I see nothing in which the power acquired over the ceded territories can

vary from the power acquired under the law of nations by any other government over acquired or ceded territory. The laws, rights, and institutions of the territory so acquired remain in full force, until rightfully altered by *the new government*;" 1 Peters' R., 517—that is, the Government of the United States newly acquiring such territory. "They do not participate in political power, nor can they share in the powers of the General Government *until they become a State and are admitted into the Union as such.*" 2 Story's C. L., § 1324. Their condition is dependent and colonial; they are not States, but the elements from which States are to be formed: not stars, but *nebulae* that may cohere and become stars of the Union.

The practice of our government has, from the beginning, conformed to these views sanctioned by the highest judicial authority. Every territorial government has been established by a law of Congress, with certain delegated legislative, as well as executive, powers; but it cannot be doubted that Congress might have exercised all legislative powers over a Territory. This delegation was a matter of expediency and discretion, not of necessity or right. If Congress can delegate the authority to an appointed territorial council or legislature, popularly elected, to admit or exclude slavery into a Territory, it follows that Congress might have directly done the same thing; and yet it would be very inexpedient for Congress to do so. Congress was bound by the terms of Virginia's cession to exclude slavery from the Northwestern territory, and by the terms of North Carolina's cession, to permit slavery south of the Ohio so far as such cession extended: 1 Story's Laws, 94, 79. Louisiana was acquired as territory where slavery had existed by law, and would have continued to exist except that it was excluded from a portion thereof by the Missouri Compromise Act. Texas, which had been exempt from slavery as Mexican territory, as an independent State adopted slavery, and was admitted into the Union with a stipulation that slavery should be permitted south, and excluded north, of the Missouri Compromise line of 36 deg. 30 min. 5 Laws U. S. 3088.

In 1850, the territorial governments of New Mexico and Utah were organized, with the liberty of being admitted as States with or without slavery, as their constitutions might prescribe.

The Missouri Compromise line was deemed an equitable division of the territory of the Union between the two great divisions of the country, conformable in latitude to natural laws that influenced slavery, and to the actual existence or the absence of it, and had the advantage of apprising settlers of a future certainty that slaves would or would not be admitted. It was a constitutional exercise of power, was acquiesced in as a peaceable settlement of a disturbing question that had intensely agitated the Union, and should not have been

repealed. Its abolition in 1854 was a direct violation of the faith of the Compromise, and also of a resolution of the Baltimore Democratic Platform of 1852, declaring "that the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing in Congress, or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question; under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made." The Democratic party has temperately rebuked those who disobeyed its mandate—has disappointed their ambitious expectations, and at Cincinnati has reiterated the Baltimore resolutions, thereby again deprecating agitation, and presented to the country a nominee for the Presidency of safe and conservative character, who had been willing to abide by the Missouri Compromise, took no part in its repeal, and who deplores an agitation and excitement that, without any results but evil, discredits the country abroad and impairs the strength of the Union. But the acts of 1854 were not a repeal, as alleged by a distinguished citizen, of the ordinance of 1787, since the Northwestern territory, to which only it applied, did not extend westward of the Mississippi, a country then belonging to Spain, and by us acquired as part of Louisiana in 1803, while the constitutions voluntarily formed by the people of all the States lying between the Ohio and Mississippi exclude slavery in conformity with the ordinance of 1787, which yet remains in force over all the territory that it was ever operative upon. A WHIG.

THE UNION.

NO. IV.

BUT the Missouri Compromise has been repealed, and it could only be restored by a repetition of the evils of prolonged agitation upon the slavery question, and thereby further alienate the affections, and more widely separate the people of the North and of the South. The substituted rule of leaving to the people of the territories the right to decide for themselves before they become States, but anticipates by a very brief period a right that then becomes absolutely theirs beyond any control of Congress, in the absence of treaty or contract obligation. Any State, the moment it is admitted to membership in the Union, if unbound by contract, has the absolute right to adopt or reject slavery within its own limits, for no power is delegated to Congress to control a State in this regard. Congress cannot re-establish slavery in Pennsylvania, nor prohibit it in Virginia; and what Congress cannot do in either of these States cannot be done by Congress in any other State, without destroying their equality of rights. With the formation of States over the western territories, therefore, the Missouri Compromise would have been forever obliterated. This must be so; for if Congress could impose a perpetual condition against

the introduction of slavery into any State, Congress would have equal authority to impose a condition to make slavery perpetual in any State: a conclusion equally revolting to the friends of States' rights, both of the South and of the North.

If the Missouri line could be re-established and made perpetual, it would not be desirable to those who desire to see the area of free labor extended, as we, the people of Pennsylvania, do. It would not only be to encounter the evils and risks of a renewed agitation, which the Pennsylvania candidate desires to allay, but it would be to fix an immovable barrier to the progress of free labor, for which the field is now fully opened to competition, and which only demand justice and fair play; and that it is entitled to by every sentiment of right and every obligation of principle and honor, moral or legal, human and divine. Slavery will be excluded from a wider area south than it will be extended even north of the old Compromise line.

By our refusing to extend the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific, Southern California has been gained to free labor, and nearly all of New Mexico, large enough for several States, may be secured against the introduction of slavery. It is not, therefore, the principle established by the legislation of Congress so much as the abhorrent practices that have taken place by the invaders of Kansas, in violation of the law. That the North has the capacity, with an open and fair field for action, to win territory to free labor, is apparent to every one who has observed the progress of Western settlements to the North and to the South. To the North there is unparalleled thrift, enterprise, success, and prosperity, which have never been rivalled at the South. For the period of the last census, the increase of the white population of the United States was 37,7394 per cent.; [De Bow, 49;] while the increase of the whole colored population was but 26.6219 per cent.; [De Bow, 87;] and the increase of the white population of the non-slaveholding States was 39.42 per cent., while the increase of the white population of the slaveholding States was but 34.26 per cent., [De Bow, 45.] Thus the laws of Providence are rapidly and unceasingly operative to gain upon and hem in slavery on its North, and now on its West, border; and if it should find a door for expansion yet further to the South, it will only the sooner surrender the Northern Slave States to the renovating hand of the industry and enterprise of freemen.

The resolutions, therefore, of the Cincinnati Convention touching the subject here discussed, cannot be regarded as hostile to free labor. Here is the extent to which they go upon this subject:

“Resolved, That we recognise the right of the people of the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the fairly expressed will of the majority of actual residents; and, whenever

the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a constitution, with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

They repudiated all sectional platforms and parties concerning domestic slavery as liable to embroil the States and produce resistance to the law—and justly; and accord to all actual settlers, acting through the fairly expressed will of the majority, the right to adopt or reject slavery—a right that every other State has exercised or may exercise; and if the settlers shall not hereafter enjoy a fair opportunity to decide the question, it will be the fault of the two branches of Congress, one having a Democratic majority, and the other a majority of opponents to the Democracy. Let each, then, be held to its proper responsibility, and we shall see who will be responsible for what may follow.

That the future Executive will not be responsible for the continuance of trouble and bloodshed in Kansas if the Pennsylvania candidate be elected, is very clear from the following impressive language uttered by him when accepting the nomination:—"Most happy would it be for the country if the long agitation were at an end. During its whole progress it has produced no practical good to any human being, whilst it has been the source of great and dangerous evils. It has alienated and estranged one portion of the Union from the other, and has even seriously threatened its very existence. To my own personal knowledge, it has produced the impression among foreign nations that our great and glorious confederacy is in constant danger of dissolution. This does us serious injury, because acknowledged power and stability always command respect among nations, and are among the best securities against unjust aggression and in favor of the maintenance of honorable peace." If these troubles be continued, it will be the fault of one or other branch of Congress, since it is plain that with adequate legislative provision, or if unrestrained by injudicious legislation, the expected Executive would execute the laws of the United States over the Territory of Kansas, preserve the peace, and secure to all actual settlers the free, equal, and just exercise of all their rights and political franchises.

A WHIG.

THE UNION.

NO. V.

To the devoted friends of the Union, it is an alarming symptom of the times that men of respectability, intelligence and influence have permitted themselves to admit a contingency on which they would consent to its dissolution—to *let it slide*—as the phrase is, as if it could quietly pass away, and the peace and prosperity of the country

remain. It makes the heart sad to reflect that it is possible that any real or imagined grievance could beget in such minds such a conclusion. Can it be that patriotism, the love of country, and our country's glory, are separable from the Union? Can men be men of honor, integrity and patriotism, and not cling to the last to the integrity and honor of the Union; and though they should be compelled to fight to the death to repress grievances and combat wrongs that individuals or party may inflict, can any one with an American heart and one patriotic feeling ever prove derelict in his fidelity to the Union? It is hard, indeed, to believe it, and yet it is apparent that many respectable and intelligent citizens have suffered themselves to put a value upon the Union—a cheap value upon it—and under the aggravations of excitements produced by temporary causes, have used expressions showing a preparation for the event, and adopted measures and selected candidates, whose success would inevitably dis sever these States. It sickens the heart of patriotism to contemplate a condition of things heretofore thought an impossibility by the American people—that this government could be dissolved—that the fair fabric of constitutional liberty, the protection of our people, and the example and hope of mankind, could be dissolved and become as a vision of the past, to be spoken of in future history as a lesson to teach the impracticability of republican freedom, as an illusion of impracticable enthusiasts that for a brief period made a successful experiment that lasted while their country was young, her people pure, simple and patriotic, but could not endure a more advanced period of society, when men's passions, selfishness and ambition obtained the mastery, and the broken fragments of the Union, after disastrous conflicts and struggles, sought tranquility and peace under military despotism.

Thoughts are now boldly spoken that at any former period would have shocked us as treasonable. The minds of youth, taught during the period of confiding trust to believe the Union imperishable, and the love of country an incentive to glorious death, and Washington's a name and object of veneration only less than divine, and his words of admonition to love and cherish the Union as sacred injunctions, are now permitted daily to hear and read expressions from men in power and place, abhorrent to patriotism, and blighting as the poison of the upas to their love of country, and shocking as sacrilege itself in their disparagement of the venerated names and history of our beloved country—a history, though brief, more impressive and glorious than any that has illumined the pages of all past time.

When men of education and influence suffer themselves to lose their respect for and disparage the Constitution, and to regard the dissolution of the Union without aversion and horror; when Legislatures adopt resolutions and political parties platforms, in conflict with the

provisions of that Constitution, without which it never could have been formed and obtained an existence; and those of fanatic zeal habitually denounce with derision, as "Union savers," patriotic citizens and statesmen who have resolved to stand by it to the death, and say "Let the Union slide," we may well fear that a moral treason has sunk deeply into the minds of certain classes of citizens, that, if not promptly checked by the body of the people in their power and majesty, may, and will, bring the government to the crisis which these false leaders have brought their minds to contemplate as a desirable event—the catastrophe of dissolution, and of the extinction of republican freedom.

Yet, disregarding all discouragements and reproaches, it becomes the duty of all patriotic citizens devoted to the Constitution of their country by the countless blessings it confers, and the numberless evils and calamities it averts, patiently to endure discussions, even though they irreverently question the wisdom of that instrument that binds the States in Union, and enabled them to achieve an unexampled prosperity, and a power and position that command the respect of the world, because that instrument itself guaranties to those who asperse it "the freedom of speech and of the press," and leaves their errors and their heresies to be dealt with by truth, public opinion and the ballot box. It behooves, therefore, every one who loves his country and his country's prosperity and honor to do such share of duty as may be within the scope of his influence and power to preserve a sound and conservative public opinion, and keep alive the spirit of patriotism and the love of country, of the Constitution and the Union, and to promote the elevation to power of those who will preserve them inviolate, and extend to the whole country an equal, just and benign protection.

A WHIG.

THE UNION.

NO. VI.

It is in the spirit of peace and humanity that this appeal is made to the people of Pennsylvania; for it is by upholding the Constitution and the Union alone, that the peace and tranquillity of the country can be maintained. That sacred rule that we preach to slave-owners, to observe to their unfortunate slaves, we are bound to practice towards those owners, our fellow-citizens: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." In the common government they must equally participate; in the common rights they must equally share; and we should dwell with them in fraternal kindness and amity. In the spirit in which our forefathers

framed the great bond of our Union—of those who had emancipated the slaves of Pennsylvania—of Franklin, Rush, Bryan, Reed, Morris, Peters and others—of Franklin and Rush, signers of the Declaration of Independence; of Franklin, a signer of the Constitution of the United States, yet both Presidents of the Pennsylvania Society for promoting the Abolition of Slavery; of Franklin who, in the convention to form that Constitution, when divisions arose therein upon this subject, that now so much disturbs and alienates the people, moved that that august body should invoke by prayer the influence of the Almighty to compose their differences, and they were composed.

When the great work was accomplished, and it was signed by “George Washington, President, by unanimous order of the convention,” it was accompanied by a letter, in which it was declared—“In all our deliberations upon this subject, we kept steadily in view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American—the Consolidation of our Union—in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence. This important consideration seriously and deeply impressed our minds, led each State in the Convention to be less rigid on points of inferior magnitude, than might have been otherwise expected; and thus the Constitution, which we now present, *is the result of a spirit of amity, and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable.*” That work which our patriot ancestors achieved with so much labor, forbearance and wisdom, shall not we, after having witnessed its magnificent results, in the same fraternal spirit maintain and perpetuate? Shall not we, too, “in a spirit of amity,” practice a like “mutual deference and concession,” to preserve a government immensely magnified in its scope and importance to ourselves, to our expanded country, and to the world?

The purpose of that great instrument, as itself declares, was “to establish justice, *insure domestic tranquillity*, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty.” It was the work of men whose names have become consecrated in the affections of the people, of names that will ever live in history, glorious to their country and to mankind. Whatever may befall our country, the history that records their doings will forever be read and excite the glow of liberty and admiration in the human heart, in all countries and in all ages. What, then, must be the infamy and disgrace of those men, and of that age of whom the truthful pages of history shall hereafter record the betrayal of so sacred a trust, of men who have dared to lay their unhallowed hands upon the ark of our safety, of men whose fratricidal arms have shed the blood of brothers, and destroyed the Constitution and liberties of their country!

When this Union shall be broken into fragments, they will not, cannot separate in peace and amity. The war now raging in Kansas will be lighted along the line between slavery and freedom for more than a thousand miles. The pursuit of slaves fleeing for liberty across that border, no longer into sister States and under a paramount law, but into unfriendly, if not hostile territory, will inevitably lead to conflicts and war. A line of fortifications and custom-houses stretching thousands of miles from East to West, will interrupt all trade and travel, and excite to hostility and conflict. War will become inevitable, and the burden of a standing army and navy a necessity, and military men become leaders, if not masters. With war will come blockaded cities, commerce be destroyed, plantations wasted, habitations smouldering ruins. Then, with wasted strength and exhausted resources, will foreign alliance be courted at the cost of liberty, or the weak fall the easy prey of foreign conquest. To the evils of civil would be added the horrors of servile war, until the intensity of its horrors should reawaken in the white race a fraternal sympathy, a sympathy of blood and kindred, that would unite all in a war of extermination of those who now excite our commiseration, and hurry us into extremes fraught with these direful consequences. A WHIG.

THE UNION.

NO. VII.

To a Pennsylvania statesman have the Democratic party conceded the honor of being their candidate for President of the United States—an honor never before conceded to a State without whose electoral vote no President has ever been elected. At a time of great excitement between the North and the South, when men of Massachusetts and men of South Carolina have met in conflict in Kansas, that party has passed by her men of extreme opinions, and made its selection of a cautious and conservative statesman, from the steady, peace-and-Union-loving State of Pennsylvania; a State that in the gratitude of her own deliverance from political thralldom, while yet amid the perils of the Revolution, abolished slavery within her borders. Is not this an earnest of moderate, temperate and safe councils? They well knew that while Pennsylvania has ever and will ever prove true to the Union, that while the rights of all the States might safely be committed to the hands of one of her most tried and experienced public servants, there is not a man in the State who would give his voice for the repeal of her glorious statute of 1780, that forever abolished slavery therein, in language that will forever appeal to the heart of humanity, and expressive of the gratitude of men that through all their lives

faithfully sustained the Union. They in a "grateful sense of the manifold blessings which they had undeservedly received from the hand of that Being from whom every good and perfect gift cometh," "conceived it to be their duty, and rejoiced that it was in their power, to extend a portion of that freedom to others which had been extended to them, and to release from that state of thralldom to which they themselves were tyrannically doomed," the slaves that Great Britain had forced upon them. Pennsylvania with pride, points to this bright page on her statutes, and to the hardy, free and happy freemen that cultivate her soil, and maintain her manufacturing and mining industry and wealth, and asks her sister States to follow her example and realize the rich rewards; but Pennsylvania leaves free all other States and Territories to enact or repeal all laws upon all subjects that she may enact or repeal; and when her sons shall be summoned into the national councils or Executive chair, she expects them with a religious fidelity to administer the national affairs for the equal benefit of all, without favor or partiality, to one State or section over another.

As the question of slavery is now the great disturbing element and chief issue in the election to take place in November, it must constitute the main subject of consideration in the discharge of the duty that will then devolve upon every qualified freeman. Hence it has been the subject of discussion in these numbers, and the views therein expressed are given to show that the conclusion is arrived at after proper care and scrutiny, and notwithstanding the writer cherishes sentiments utterly repugnant to the extension of slavery. With him the paramount question is that of the safe administration of the General Government and the perpetuation of the Union.

The choice to be made he regards as between two of the candidates, one of them a ripe and experienced statesman, who for forty years has faithfully and prudently, with capacity and judgment, served his country in both Houses of Congress, as Secretary of State, and as Minister abroad on the most responsible missions, and in all positions acquitted himself with ability. The other is of untried statesmanship, have been in the Senate but a short period, and is unknown to the nation except as an adventurous explorer of the Far West, for which he is entitled to all credit for his bold adventurers. But to accept him as the Chief Magistrate of this great Republic upon such a recommendation, must be regarded by citizens who will seriously reflect upon the high trust to be confided, and the vastly responsible duties to be performed, as an extraordinary proceeding, and produce alarm for the safety of our country. It certainly is calculated to impress all who will calmly reflect upon the subject, with the idea that the judgment of multitudes of men is very easily carried away by an impulse; by a feeling that in the beginning proved the greatest obstacle to the

1196

formation of the Constitution, and ever since, and now is, that which is fraught with the greatest danger to the Union. Will not citizens pause and reflect, and behold where this impulse is driving the country, before it be too late? Those who minister to that impulse are not likely to be restrained by the checks of the Constitution, or to be governed by any carefully balanced consideration of the equal rights of the States, of the South, as well as of the North, and any error in this respect may impel to a resistance, or secession, as fatal to the integrity of the Union, as proved the American Revolution to that of the British Empire. George the Third never intended to lose his American colonies; but his unwise, short-sighted, and obstinate ministry drove matters to an extremity beyond reconciliation, and lost to his crown his best dominions. But these men of impulse, and one idea, say that the people of the South know too well in what their own safety consists to separate. But that is language that can never be safely held to freemen; for freemen can never be safely wronged or endure oppression; could they, it is infinitely unbecoming in us of the North to act upon any such assumption, and confesses a purpose of wrong utterly at variance with the spirit that formed and must sustain the Union.

A WHIG.